

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

YOUSIF H. HALLOUM and  
IMAN Y. HALLOUM,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WELLS FARGO NATIONAL; CLEAR  
RECON CORP.; WILMINGTON SAVINGS  
FUND SOCIETY,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01077-GMN-EJY

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is the Motion to Stay Discovery Pending Wells Fargo Bank's Motion to Dismiss. ECF No. 26. Wells Fargo filed a supplement to its Motion to Stay at ECF No. 32. Plaintiffs filed an Opposition to the Supplement at ECF No. 34. Plaintiffs also filed a Motion in Opposition to the Court deciding "dismissal of the case before discovery." ECF No. 36. Neither the Opposition to the Supplement nor the Opposition to the Court ruling on Wells Fargo's Motion to Dismiss before discovery offer any substantive arguments. ECF Nos. 34, 36. Instead, these filings state, in conclusory form, that the Court should not stay discovery and should not decide the Motion to Dismiss without discovery. *Id.* Plaintiffs filed a Motion seeking extensions of time, but that Motion does not mention or pertain to the Motion to Stay Discovery. *See* ECF No. 29.

Plaintiffs fail to offer any substantive response to Wells Fargo's Motion to Stay. Under United States District Court for the District of Nevada Local Rule 7-2(d), the Court may treat this failure as Plaintiffs' consent to grant the Motion. LR 7-2(d); *Duensing v. Gilbert*, Case No. 2:11-cv-01747-GMN-VCF, 2013 WL 1316890 (D. Nev. Mar. 1, 2013) (failing to respond to defendant's arguments on the issue constituting consent to the granting of the motion); *Schmitt v. Furlong*, Case No. 3:11-cv-00602-LRH-VPC, 2013 WL 432632 (D. Nev. Feb. 4, 2013) (failure to argue against substantive due process violations indicated consent to granting summary judgment); *Gudenavichene v. Mortgage Elec. Registration Sys.*, Case No. 2:12-cv-83 JCM (GWF), 2012 WL

1 1142868 (D. Nev. Apr. 4, 2012) (plaintiff's failure to respond to any of the arguments raised in the  
2 motion to dismiss constituted consent to granting the motion).

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Motion to Stay Discovery Pending Wells  
4 Fargo Bank's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 26) is GRANTED.

5 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if the ruling on the Motion to Dismiss does not dispose of  
6 this case in its entirety, the parties must file a discovery plan and scheduling order no later than  
7 fourteen (14) days thereafter.

8 Dated this 8th day of August, 2024.

9  
10   
11 ELAYNA J. YOUCHAH  
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28